

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/903,788	SADA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Drew E Becker	1761	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Drew E Becker. (3) _____
(2) Mardson McQuay (4) _____

Date of Interview: 4-8-04

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 6 & 18

Identification of prior art discussed: none

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: see below

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Discussed the 112(i) rejections & duplicate claims 6 & 18. Claims 6 & 18 appear to be similar in scope. Applicant will likely amend the claims to remove these issues. The limitation of a single blower appears to be supported by the specification & would likely remove the 112(i) rejection.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Drew Becker
Examiner's signature, if required